

REMARKS

By the Amendment, claim 4 has been amended and claims 1-3 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 10-16 are newly added. Support for the amendments may be found throughout Applicant's originally filed specification. Applicant submits that no new matter has been introduced. Accordingly, claims 3-16 are presently pending, of which claim 4 is the sole independent claim.

Reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims, in view of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

I. Prior Art Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103

A. Claims 1, 4 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP 2003-015651 to Torii ("Torii"). Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicant submits that the cited portions of Torii fail to disclose or teach an electronic apparatus comprising, *inter alia*, a pair of speaker units, left and right, located in a casing, each of the speaker units including a cabinet, a speaker arranged in the cabinet and exposed to the outside of the cabinet, and a port which is defined in the cabinet to open the outside of the cabinet and through which a sound emitted from the backside of the speaker into the cabinet is radiated outward from the cabinet and into the casing, the speaker being exposed to the outside of the casing through an opening defined in an outside wall of the casing, and the casing having openings through which sounds emitted from the ports of the speaker units into the casing and synthesized together in the casing are radiated to the outside of the casing, as recited in independent claim 4.

For example, the cited portions of Torii disclose a sound system which includes a slim speaker box 12 for holding one or more bass speakers 11. It appears from Torii that the rear of each speaker 11 protrudes out of the speaker box 12 through an opening 12a1 and 12a2 in the top face of the speaker box 12. [See Torii; Figures 1-2]. Thus, the openings 12a1, 12a1, alleged by the Office Action to be the claimed ports, do not appear to be open to the outside of the speaker box 12 (which appears to most closely correspond to the claimed cabinet) through which a sound emitted from the backside of the speaker *into the cabinet is radiated outward from the cabinet*

and into the casing. Rather, it appears from Torii that sound is only emitted from the backside of each speaker into the casing 5, and not radiated outward from the speaker box 12 and into the casing 5.

In addition, the cited portions of Torii appear silent with regard to synthesizing the sounds emitted from the right and left ports to the inside of the casing, and radiating the synthesized sound to the outside of the casing. While Torii also shows that a bass reflex port 12b1 may be located on the front of the side board 12b of the speaker box 12, it appears that the bass reflex port 12b1 does not communicate with the inside of the casing 5 for emitting sound from the speaker box 12 to the inside of the casing 5. Rather, Figure 2 of Torii appears to show that the right and left side boards 12b of the speaker box 12 are not covered with the casing 5.

Accordingly, Applicant submit that the cited portions of Torii fail to disclose or teach each and every feature of independent claim 4. Claim 7 depends respectively from claim 4 and therefore, is patentable for at least the same reasons provided above related to claim 4 and for the additional features recited therein. Claim 1 has been cancelled and therefore the rejection thereof is moot. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) of claims 4 and 7 over Torii should be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

B. Claims 3 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Torii in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,476,304 to Uehara ("Uehara"). Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, the cited portions of Torii fail to disclose or teach each and every feature of independent claim 4. Claim 9 depends respectively from claim 4 and therefore, is patentable for at least the same reasons provided above related to claim 4 and for the additional features recited therein. Claim 3 has been cancelled and therefore the rejection thereof is moot.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claim 9 over Torii in view of Uehara should be withdrawn and the claim be allowed.

C. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Torii in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP 07-222278 to Watanabe ("Watanabe"). Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, the cited portions of Torii fail to disclose or teach each and every feature of independent claim 4. Claim 5 depends respectively from claim 4 and therefore, is patentable for at least the same reasons provided above related to claim 4 and for the additional features recited therein.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claim 5 over Torii in view of Watanabe should be withdrawn and the claim be allowed.

D. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Torii in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,550,921 to Freadman ("Freadman"). Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, the cited portions of Torii fail to disclose or teach each and every feature of independent claim 4. Claim 6 depends respectively from claim 4 and therefore, is patentable for at least the same reasons provided above related to claim 4 and for the additional features recited therein.

In addition, the cited portions of Freadman make no mention or suggestion that the *speaker units are arranged in the casing* nor that *the respective ports thereof are opposed to each other*, as recited in claim 6. Rather, in Freadman the speaker units 10 are attached to the outside surface of the mixer cavity 12 and the bass ports 20 are both located perpendicular to the surface on which they are mounted (i.e., they are parallel to one other). [See Freadman, Figure 2, and col. 2, lines 17-18].

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claim 6 over Torii in view of Freadman should be withdrawn and the claim be allowed.

E. Claims 1-4, 7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,744,623 to Numano et al. ("Numano") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,359,994 to Markow et al. ("Markow"). Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicant submits that the cited portions of Numano fail to disclose or teach an electronic apparatus comprising, *inter alia*, a pair of speaker units, left and right, located in a casing, each of the speaker units including a cabinet, a speaker arranged in the cabinet and exposed to the outside of the cabinet, and a port which is defined in the cabinet to open the outside of the

cabinet and through which a sound emitted from the backside of the speaker into the cabinet is radiated outward from the cabinet and into the casing, the speaker being exposed to the outside of the casing through an opening defined in an outside wall of the casing, and the casing having openings through which sounds emitted from the ports of the speaker units into the casing and synthesized together in the casing are radiated to the outside of the casing, as recited in independent claim 4.

As conceded by the Office Action at page 4, “Numano fails to show the cabinets having ports.”

Further, Applicant submits that none of the cited portions of Markow overcome the shortcomings of Numano. For example, the cited portions of Markow make no mention or suggestion of a port which is defined in the cabinet to open the outside of the cabinet and through which a sound emitted from the backside of the speaker into the cabinet is radiated outward from the cabinet and into the casing, nor that the casing has openings through which sounds emitted from the ports of the speaker units into the casing and synthesized together in the casing are radiated to the outside of the casing. Rather, Markow discloses that the sounds emitted from a *single* rear-firing enhancement speaker unit 107 may be reflected off a surface 202 (e.g., a wall) outside of the casing and synthesized together at the listener’s position 200. [See Markow, col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 9. Figure 2].

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the cited portions of Numano, Markow, or a proper combination thereof fail to disclose or render obvious each and every feature of independent claim 4. Claims 7 and 9 depend respectively from claim 4 and therefore, are patentable for at least the same reasons provided above related to claim 4 and for the additional features recited therein. Claims 1-3 have been cancelled and therefore the rejection thereof is moot. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claims 4, 7 and 9 over Numano in view of Markow should be withdrawn and the claim be allowed.

II. New Claims 10-16

New claims 10-16 depend respectively from claim 4 and therefore, is patentable for at least the same reasons provided above related to claim 4 and for the additional features recited therein.

III. Conclusion.


All matters having been addressed and in view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicant's representative remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

By: 
E. RICO HERNANDEZ
Reg. No. 47641
Tel. No. 703.770.7788
Fax No. 703.770.7901

Date: December 14, 2007
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900